UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
SCOTT CAWTHON,	X :	
Scott caw mon,	· :	
Plaintiff,	:	22-cv-7398 (AS)
	:	OPPER ADOPTING
-V-	:	ORDER ADOPTING
NGAN THI PHUONG NGUYEN,	:	<u>REPORT AND</u> RECOMMENDATION
Defendant.	:	
	:	
ARUN SUBRAMANIAN, United States District	1.	

An inquest into damages in this case was referred to Magistrate Judge Cave for a Report and Recommendation. *See* Docket No. 25. In the Report and Recommendation filed on January 23, 2024, Magistrate Judge Cave recommended that the Court grant damages totaling \$22,732.50, plus post-judgment interest. *See* Docket No. 31 at 27.

In reviewing a Report and Recommendation, a district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district court "must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *see also United States v. Male Juvenile*, 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir. 1997). To accept those portions of the report to which no timely objection has been made, however, a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record. *See, e.g., Wilds v. United Parcel Serv.*, 262 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).

In the present case, the Report and Recommendation advised the parties that they had fourteen days from service of the Report and Recommendation to file any objections, and warned that failure to timely file such objections would result in waiver of any right to object. *See* Docket

Case 1:22-cv-07398-AS-SLC Document 33 Filed 04/10/24 Page 2 of 2

No. 31 at 29. In addition, the Report and Recommendation expressly called the parties' attention

to Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Nevertheless, as of

the date of this Order, no objections have been filed and no request for an extension of time to

object has been made. Accordingly, the parties have waived the right to object to the Report and

Recommendation or to obtain appellate review. See Frank v. Johnson, 968 F.2d 298, 300 (2d Cir.

1992); see also Caidor v. Onondaga County, 517 F.3d 601 (2d Cir. 2008).

Despite the waiver, the Court has reviewed the petition and the Report and

Recommendation, unguided by objections, and finds the Report and Recommendation to be well

reasoned and grounded in fact and law. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is

ADOPTED in its entirety.

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter the judgment recommended by Magistrate Judge

Cave at page 27 of Dkt. 31 and close this case.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 10, 2024

New York, New York

ARUN SUBRAMANIAN

United States District Judge